

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-41 are pending in this case.

Claims 1-4, 15-22, and 33-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews, III et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0139465 ("Matthews") in view of Shoff et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0015815 ("Shoff") in further view of Legall et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,005,565 ("Legall").

Claims 5-14 and 23-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Shoff in view of Legall and further in view of Herz et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,758,257 ("Herz").

Applicants' Reply

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 15-22, and 33-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Shoff in further view of Legall. The Examiner rejected claims 5-14 and 23-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Shoff in view of Legall and further in view of Herz. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The present application is entitled to a priority date of July 26, 1996 as a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/416,161, filed on October 11, 1999, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/837,078, filed on April 11, 1997, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/022,826 ("the '826 application"), filed on July 26, 1996. Support for the claims can be found, for example, on page 20, line 19-page 21, line 33, page 28, lines 13-17, and page 29, lines 1-4 of the '826 application.

The Examiner admits that Matthews and Shoff fail to disclose searching, over a public network, at least one information database and wherein the data comprise search results obtained from the at least one information database (Office Action, page 7). The Examiner attempts to make up for the deficiencies of Matthews and Shoff using Legall. However, because the filing date of Legall (i.e., March 25, 1997) is after that of applicants' priority date (i.e., July 26, 1996), Legall is not available as prior art against the present application. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of

applicants' independent claims 1 and 19 should be withdrawn. Because claims 2-18 and 20-41 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 or 19, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are accordingly respectfully requested.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response other than those indicated on the attached Petition for Extension of Time. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-1075 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Miranda J. Ha/
Miranda J. Ha
Registration No.: 65,073
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Attorneys/Agents For Applicants
Customer No. 75563